



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

lished original documents. M. Passy has been "pained" for long years to see Vettori "left in the shadow, sacrificed to the glory of Machiavelli and the fame of Guicciardini". In this most sympathetic and careful biography M. Passy has drawn Vettori from the shadow. He has thrown the life of his hero against the background of those episodes in the history of Florence and of Italy in which Vettori took part, illustrating it by letters and following it with critical judgments, in an easy and agreeable style, and with a pleasant and contagious enthusiasm. He throws into relief Vettori's intimacy with Piero Strozzi and Lorenzo de' Medici, the father of Catherine. He brings out his friendship for Machiavelli, who wrote, "In the midst of all my happiness nothing has ever pleased me as much as your conversation, because I always borrowed something from it."

He believes him devoted to the cause of the Medici out of sincere friendship and the love of Florence because he thought their rule would give her the best chance of ordered government. He finds him neither better nor worse than Guicciardini and Machiavelli but like them indifferent in regard to the means by which he brought about the peace of Florence.

That Vettori spent his best thought and vigor in helping to bring Florence under the dominion of the later Medicis without putting before them any ideal like that which Machiavelli showed Lorenzo in the last chapter of *The Prince*, seems to M. Passy negligible in his final judgment, "For it is not entirely the fault of Vettori if, by the force of events, he was drawn toward the end of his life, under the patronage of the degenerate Medicis, into the establishment of the Duchy—into the government of Alexander and Cosimo de Medici".

Whether the writings of Vettori translated and commented on in these volumes show him to be the equal of Machiavelli with the pen—whether his dominant motive was an unselfish love of Florence—these are matters of taste and judgment on which reasonable men may differ, but all reasonable men who love Florentine history will be grateful to M. Passy for his life of Vettori.

PAUL VAN DYKE.

Anglo-Roman Relations, 1558-1565. By C. G. BAYNE, C.S.I. [Oxford Historical and Literary Studies, issued under the Direction of C. H. Firth and Walter Raleigh, Professors of Modern History and English Literature in the University of Oxford, vol. II.] (Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1913. Pp. 335.)

THE efforts of Popes Paul IV. and Pius IV. to retain, and, after losing it, to regain the Church of England for the Roman Communion have hitherto received only passing notice from historians. And yet a correct understanding of those efforts and the causes of their failure is indispensable to a full comprehension of that bewildering confusion

of contradictory policies, both religious and political, which marks the first decade of the reign of Elizabeth. The present book will go far towards diminishing the obscurity which has hitherto hung over this traditionally difficult topic. The author has already made a name for himself in the early Elizabethan field;¹ his foot-notes indicate a wide acquaintance with the literature of his subject; a most valuable appendix of sixty-eight carefully selected documents from the archives of England, Spain, France, Belgium, and Austria, the large majority of which have never been printed before, shows that his work rests for the most part on the sources. The persons and scenes which go to make up the story shift with such amazing rapidity and subtlety as to defy any adequate summary within the limits of a brief review. We can only pause to notice a few points of special interest.

Perhaps the fact of outstanding importance is that throughout the period covered "the net result of Philip II.'s policy was to make him the best friend of the English Reformation" (pp. 224-225). His dread of France and his need of Elizabeth's good-will—especially in view of the critical situation in the Netherlands—led him again and again to obstruct papal programmes of active hostility against England. In this connection we would suggest that the most probable explanation of the fact (which Mr. Bayne calls one of the "mysteries of history", p. 39) that Paul IV. threatened the Catholic Charles V. and even Cardinal Pole, and yet at first moved no finger against the Protestant Elizabeth, lies in that fiery pontiff's bitter detestation of the House of Hapsburg. The fact that Mary Tudor was the wife of Philip II. and Pole the servant of both, blinded him to their loyalty to the Church: while Elizabeth, though unorthodox, was at least free from Austrian contamination. In view of the recent emphasis which has been laid on the extreme Protestantism of Leicester and the conservatism of Burghley at a later date,² it is interesting to notice how in this period the rôles are reversed. In Burghley's eyes the pope was Antichrist, "the sworn foe of all good Englishmen" (p. 225). The queen's chief minister showed "sympathies entirely on the side of reform", while Leicester (p. 85) planned to buy Philip's support in his suit for the hand of Elizabeth by promising that, if he were successful, he would bring England back to communion with Rome. Indeed at one time, in consequence of the queen's weakness for Leicester, the policy of England seemed likely "to shoot madly from its sphere". But in the end discretion triumphed over love. Leicester was rejected; Martinengo, the papal nuncio, was refused admittance to the realm; the crisis was passed, and from that time onward Elizabeth moved steadily along a path which diverged further and further from the road to Rome.

Limitations of space forbid the consideration of other interesting

¹ Cf. *English Historical Review*, XXIII. 455-476, 643-682 (1908).

² Cf. C. Read, "Walsingham and Burghley in Queen Elizabeth's Privy Council", *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXVIII. 34-58 (1913).

and significant passages in Mr. Bayne's book. There is much to applaud and little to criticize. We are unable to understand why the author constantly refers to Philip II. as "the eldest son of the church" (e. g., pp. 120, 123). There is an unfortunate misprint in the foot-note to page 45. One closes the book with a feeling that there is grave danger of underestimating the importance of political considerations in determining religious policies, even in the period of the Counter Reformation at its height.

ROGER B. MERRIMAN.

The Rise and Fall of the High Commission. By ROLAND G. USHER, Ph.D., Associate Professor of History, Washington University, St. Louis. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1913. Pp. 380.)

PROFESSOR USHER has done a careful and needed piece of work in this volume. The High Commission is so foreign in its nature to modern ideas of legal procedure, and ended its career in such execration, that an examination as to its real nature and method of procedure was eminently fitting. The task is the more difficult because of the extensive disappearance of its records, destroyed, the author believes, though definite proof is lacking, in connection with its abolition by the Long Parliament.

Professor Usher makes it evident that the High Commission was a gradual growth rather than a creation of a definite statute. The great changes wrought by the abolition of the Roman jurisdiction and the assertion of the royal supremacy led to the exercise of that supremacy in ecclesiastical matters by royal commissions at first of a more or less temporary character and with extensive and most broadly defined powers of a visitatorial nature. Henry VIII. so used Cromwell, who in turn employed subcommissioners. Edward VI. and Mary employed them, and Elizabeth simply continued the existing practice. "In the history of these commissions, there was no important change at either the year 1559, when the statute of 1 Elizabeth, c. 1, was passed, nor in 1565, when the Elizabethan religious settlement became firmly established." The High Commission was not "created" in 1559.

Gradually, however, the temporary and visitatorial character of the commission became transformed into permanency and prevailingly judicial authority, though both visitatorial and judicial aspects continued long intermingled. The practical evolution of the High Commission into predominantly a court of law, the author would view as accomplished by about 1580. As a court, it was marked by a number of unlikenesses to common-law tribunals. The presumption of guilt was against the accused. Subject to fine and imprisonment for refusal, he had to take oath *ex officio* to answer truthfully before being informed of the accusation. No jury was, of course, in use, and the nature of proof was undefined. The basis for the existence of such a court was